

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/723,637	11/26/2003	Darren S. Shechan	60,246-288; 10,451	6442	
26096	7590 11/30/2005		EXAMINER		
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C. 400 WEST MAPLE ROAD			MAYEKAR, KISHOR		
SUITE 350	IM EE ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			1753		

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/723,6	337	SHEEHAN, DARREN S.				
		Examine	er	Art Unit				
		Kishor M	ayekar	1753				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
Period fo	, ,	NO DEDI V 10 OFT	TO EVENE A MONTH	(C) OD TUUDTY (2	ON DAVE			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAnsions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commuperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply we ply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	AILING DATE OF T f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no e nication. utory period will apply and rill, by statute, cause the ap	HIS COMMUNICATION I went, however, may a reply be tir will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from poplication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	l on <u>26 November</u>	<u>2003</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.							
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected.							
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ion and/or election	requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:								
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
	ee the attached detailed Office action	TOT A HIST OF THE CEL	uned copies not receive	su.				
Attachmen								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT	·O-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
3) M Inform	e of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Pr nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P r No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/03</u> .		5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		O-152)			

Art Unit: 1753

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The subject matter "the installation of the fluid purification in an HVAC system" as claimed in claim 9 needs proper antecedent basis in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and § 103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,637 Page 3

Art Unit: 1753

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which

said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the

invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 6-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly

anticipated by Reisfeld et al. (US 6,716,406 B2). Reisfeld's invention is directed

to a control system for a photocatalytic air purifier. Reisfeld discloses that the

photocatalytic air purifier comprises the recited fluid handling component,

substrate, catalyst and UV light source (Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 27-32).

5. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Reisfeld '406 in view of Lentz et al. (US 6,438,971 B1) and either Yamanaka et al.

(US 5,919,422) or Goswami (US 5,835,840). The difference between Reisfeld and

the instant claims are the provision of the UV light source between the fluid

handling component and the susbtrate. Lentz shows in a photocatalytic air

treatment the placement of the light source either downstream or upstream of the

Page 4

Art Unit: 1753

evaporator coil (col. 5, lines 34-45). Yamanaka shows in a photocatalytic air treatment the provision of the photocatalyst downstream from the evaporator and the UV light source in between the evaporator and the photocatalyst (Fig. 10). Goswami shows in a photocatalytic system for indoor air quality the provision of a photocatalyst downstream from an evaporator and the UV light source in between the evaporator and the photocatalyst (Figs. 1 and 3-5). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Reinsfeld as shown by Lentz and either Yamanaka or Goswami because rearrangement of parts was held to have been obvious, In re Japikse 86 USPQ 70. Further, it has been held that the motivation to make a specific structure is always related to the properties or uses one skilled in the art would expect the structure to have, In re Newell 13 USPQ 2d 1248, Fromson v. Advance Offset Plate 225 USPQ 26; In re Gyurik 201 USPQ 552.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

Application/Control Number: 10/723,637 Page 5

Art Unit: 1753

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rishor Mayekar Primary Examiner Art Unit 1753